

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 BRANDON EUGENE HUNTER,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 BRENNEMAN, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16

No. 2:22-cv-1141 DJC CKD P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff has filed a motion asking that the court compel defendants to respond to requests  
18 for discovery. However, plaintiff does not identify which responses are inadequate. Instead, he  
19 complains about the defendants' responses in general terms. Because plaintiff has not shown that  
20 any particular response by defendants to any particular request for discovery is inadequate,  
21 plaintiff's motion to compel will be denied.

22 While not entirely clear, it also appears plaintiff asserts that certain responses were not  
23 timely. Plaintiff appears to be under the misimpression that defendants had 30 days to respond to  
24 his requests for discovery. However, in the court's April 21, 2023 order, the parties were advised  
25 that any response to any request for discovery is due 45 days after the request is served.

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

For all the foregoing reasons, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 37) is denied.

Dated: January 10, 2024



---

CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1  
hunt1141.mtc